

REMARKS

By this Response, claims 1, 8, 12 and 19 have been amended and claims 7 and 18 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 2-4 and 11 have been previously canceled. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10, 12-17, and 19-21 are pending.

At the outset, Applicant is pleased to note that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 6-8 and 17-19 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the claim amendments provided above reflect this indication.

Advisory Action

In the Advisory Action mailed February 15, 2007, the Examiner indicates that the claim amendment "wherein said array low voltage control circuit provides said enhanced low operating voltage V_{ESS} at lower value during said READ operation than during said WRITE operation" will require a new search.

It is respectfully submitted that this is the very same subject matter indicated as allowable by the Examiner in the Final Office Action of September 26, 2006. The Examiner has presented no further rejections as to why the limitations of now canceled claims 7 and 18, as incorporated into independent claims 1 and 12 at the Examiner's indication, are not allowable. Accordingly, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 9-10, 12-16 and 20-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-16 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Inaba* (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,732). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 are directed to an SRAM array and a method of operating an SRAM device comprising, *inter alia*, wherein said enhanced low operating voltage V_{ESS} is provided at a lower value during READ operation than during a WRITE operation.

It is the Examiner's position that *Inaba* describes an SRAM device and method as previously claimed, but does not teach or suggest that the enhanced low operating voltage V_{ESS} is provided at a lower value during READ operation than during a WRITE operation as incorporated into independent claims 1 and 12 from dependent claims 7 and 18, respectively.

Accordingly, all claims now present in the application should be considered allowable as incorporating allowable subject matter therein and depending from allowable claims.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5, 9-10, 12-16 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant further submits that claims 5 and 9-10 are in condition for allowance, as are claims 13-16 and 20-21, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 12, respectively.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references applied against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-16-2007

By: Barbara A. Fisher

Barbara A. Fisher

Reg. No. 31,906

Timothy M. Hsieh

Reg. No. 42,672

MH2 Technology Law Group, LLP

Tel: 703.917.0000